

At that time I found that the theory that members of both houses of Parliament should be in a straitjacket and not able to express their free opinion on matters that came under crown companies was absurd. Now it is refreshing for me to see representatives of both parties uniting to complain about what is wrong and to express their willingness to remedy it.

I had a personal experience with the C.B.C. One day on a certain program some shameful things were said by a drunkard. What trouble I had to obtain some information about that from the C.B.C! I spoke to Dr. McCann, the minister responsible. I had to rely on the help of his secretary who showed considerable determination to obtain the information. I was told finally that the program was all right because the one who had said those foolish things over the TV was a *clochard*—a bum. Everything was all right; he was a bum. I do not think any bum should be allowed to use the facilities of the C.B.C. in order to address the Canadian people at large. That was one experience.

I had another experience which concerned the suppression of the word "mass" from a weekly program on the C.B.C. There is a mass that is celebrated every Sunday, sometimes at Ville St. Laurent, near Montreal, and sometimes in other churches. It is a beautiful mass, and the sermons are delivered by preachers of renown. In the first place, the name of the mass, which is highly respected, was replaced by "Meeting of the Faithful," or "assemblée des fidèles."

A meeting of the faithful could have been a meeting of the Ladies of the Holy Family, or a meeting of the church wardens, or a meeting of the beadles. I do not know why, but they did not want to use the word "mass", and afterwards, to my surprise, it was completely dropped from the program.

I then wrote to the president, Mr. Alphonse Ouimet, to complain about it. He told me he would see to it, and, in fact, under his presidency the Sunday mass was restored and it appeared again on the program. This shows that it is not a bad thing to speak to the authorities of the C.B.C. I always relied on the fairness and common sense of Mr. Alphonse Ouimet in order to have wrongs on the C.B.C. redressed as much as possible.

But now there is an underground authority over there. There is a certain group of people who seem to be viciously inspired, and who bring before the public pictures that should be burned. The scenes that are shown

over the TV and the words that are said over the radio, especially at night, are unbelievable. Where does it come from? Who is responsible for it? It would be a good thing to know that. A study of the whole business would reveal who is responsible for it, and the action to take would be to fire them and be rid of them.

The trouble nowadays is that we live in a time when there is a crisis of authority. Nobody listens to anybody, and there is no longer any hierarchy. I believe in hierarchy, because without a well organized hierarchy order could not exist. I remember when I was at school the first thing we had to write on the first page of our copy books was the phrase "Ordo ducit ad Deum"—order leads to God. Order shall exist in society; everything should be in its own place. We have now anarchy and disorder. Why? We have it for the very simple reason that the basis or foundation of liberty is ignored. No one knows what liberty is, and those who ignore it the most are those who speak the most of it. They speak about freedom, about liberty, and about human rights. But, honourable senators, if you look at the Bill of Rights you will find in it no definition of human rights, liberty, or freedom.

At this very session, in the spring, when the gentlemen who is responsible for the drafting of laws in the Department of Justice appeared before the committee on the Interpretation Bill I asked him, "Is there any definition of 'freedom' and 'liberty' in the Bill of Rights?" he answered me honestly by saying, "No." Honourable senators, you all know that. We do not know what is liberty. We do not know what is freedom. We do not know what is meant by human rights. What is taken for liberty is licence, and licence is boundless liberty. It is the kind of liberty that encroaches upon the rights of the neighbour. Where does my liberty end, honourable colleagues? It ends where your own liberty starts, so that there is no conflict between your liberty and mine. Is that clear enough?

I think I have told you that one day I received a memorandum—and recently I was able to put my finger on it in my files—from the dean of one of the faculties of a well-known university not far from here. He tried to give me a definition of "liberty". He spoke of liberty, freedom, and human rights, but he did not define any one of those words. He did not say anything about responsibility. For each liberty that one has there is a corresponding or co-relative responsibility. Am I clear enough? I think you understand me. It is because the responsibility of any individual